

we need to bring more secrecy in the political process?

Mr. Speaker, this is a question of credibility. The Republicans talk a lot about rebuilding trust with the American people. If they really mean it, they should come clean and reveal the contributors and their expenses on GOPAC.

□ 1130

DISASTROUS SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT MUST BE FIXED

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the current Safe Drinking Water Act is a disaster and must be fixed as it is reauthorized. This Member is committed to supporting legislation which will inject more common sense into the way that public drinking water supplies are tested, monitored, and treated.

It is certainly encouraging that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the new chairman of the Commerce Committee, has indicated his intention to place a high priority on revising and improving Safe Drinking Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing financial crisis for communities across the country that becomes more evident each year as new water testing and treatment deadlines are imposed. These unfunded mandates hit small communities especially hard. Not only are these mandates costly, they often do nothing to ensure safe drinking water. It is clear that States and communities must be allowed to identify and focus on those contaminants which present an actual health risk in their geographic area.

Without question, the safety of this Nation's drinking water must be vigorously protected. However, in these days of tightening budgets on the local, State, and Federal levels, it is more important than ever that this goal be reached in a realistic cost-effective, and efficient manner.

THE FRUITS OF EXTREME PARTISANSHIP

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme concern over the judgment displayed by colleagues from the Sixth District of Georgia. His need to fire long-time friend and associate Christina Jeffrey from the office of House Historian only demonstrates his folly in trying to politicize every aspect of the administration of this House.

He first fired our bipartisan Historian in order to have a personal biographer. I wonder, had Ms. Jeffrey been retained, how she would have recorded

the Ethics Committee investigation of GOPAC.

Well, it turns out Ms. Jeffrey feels that the Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan do not get to tell their side of the story to our children in their history classes.

Mr. Speaker, such are the fruits of extreme partisanship. It deserves no place in this House.

THE UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT OF 1995, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD REDUCING UNFUNDED MANDATES

(Mr. MARTINI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear over the last several years that the burden of unfunded Federal mandates placed on States and localities has risen to unacceptable levels. I am pleased to inform that yesterday, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee took the first step in addressing this problem by marking up H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

As a local official in New Jersey, I have felt the sting of unfunded mandates firsthand. Despite cutting discretionary county spending by 3 percent in 1994, the part of the State and county budget mandated by the Federal Government actually rose by 10 percent. Despite our best efforts, we were forced to raise county taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers are angry, not just because Federal taxes are too high, but because local property taxes are also skyrocketing due to unfunded mandates.

The voters spoke loudly on November 2. What they demanded was a government that was smaller, smarter, and less costly. Today we begin the process of accomplishing all three goals by putting an end to unfunded mandates and returning to the U.S. Government to its proper role in its relationship with the States.

ON THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., HOLIDAY EVERY AMERICAN CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

(Ms. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in anticipation of the 10th celebration of the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday, which has been designated as a national day of service, to encourage my colleagues and all Americans to be mindful of the national theme: On the King holiday every American can make a difference.

The King holiday challenges Americans to remember and celebrate, but most importantly, to act to address the issues for which Dr. King and others gave of their lives, their energies, their talents. One of Dr. King's philosophies evolves around the promise that every

individual can achieve his or her dream in America.

To accomplish this goal, the Government must be a partner with the people. In keeping the dream alive, we must address the unfinished agenda and direct our efforts to reduce violence, help youths at risk, promote interracial cooperation and economic stability. By doing so, we can make every American experience the land of opportunity once again.

LET US ENACT THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT NOW

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the historic opening day of the 104th Congress was the start of a new era in American politics. A majority of both Democrats and Republicans voted to reform the House of Representatives to make it more open and more accountable to the American people.

Now that we have changed the way business is done in the House, it is time to change the business that the House does, starting with a balanced budget amendment.

As I traveled through my district, I listened to the people I represent tell me that Congress should direct its finances the same way as the rest of America does. The message I have heard is that families wisely live within their monthly salaries, so why does Congress continually fail to do the same?

It is time for Congress to start living within its means by balancing the budget. It is time to change the business Congress does. Let us enact the balanced budget amendment now.

WHAT PROGRAMS WILL BE CUT TO ACHIEVE THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT?

(Mr. BECERRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this country deserve to know what is really at stake when it comes to the balanced budget. Everybody agrees we have to reduce and ultimately eliminate the Federal budget deficit, but what will it really take to get a balanced budget in 7 years without touching the amount of money we now spend on defense as the Republican majority proposes, while at the same time offering a big cut in income taxes?

The Republican leadership is doing a real disservice to the American people by refusing to disclose what kinds of middle class programs we will probably have to get rid of in order to have to balance the budget by 2002.

Just a few minutes ago in the Committee on the Judiciary the Republican

majority defeated an amendment to exclude Social Security from cuts to balance the budget.

What about student assistance? Probably kiss it goodbye. Unemployment insurance? Major cuts. Medicare programs? Devastating cuts. What about cures for cancer? Our research institutions are facing massive cuts if this budget amendment passes.

These are just a few examples of the kinds of massive program cuts that will occur. It is time for this open Congress to be truly open and tell the people how it will balance the budget.

CONGRESSIONAL LAWMAKERS CAN COACH AMERICA TO FISCAL VICTORY

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1971, the Nebraska Cornhuskers won college football's national championship. One year later coach Tom Osborne became head coach, and over the last two decades has dedicated his life to challenging young athletes to achieve their very best.

Many times over this last quarter century the loyal fans of the Cornhuskers felt the ground swell of a pending national championship victory, only to know the disappointment as that victory slipped away.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, since 1935 the American people have diligently petitioned this body for a balanced budget. Year after year they watched and waited, believing reform was within their grasp, only to see the national debt and government spending increase.

They have waited patiently for lawmakers to bring them relief from the increasing tax burdens, only to suffer the disappointment of another legislative year gone by with no visible victory won over the skyrocketing debt.

Mr. Speaker, as lawmakers we have a chance to coach America's team to a fiscal victory. We came here armed with a mandate to pass the balanced budget. I encourage it to happen this year.

PUBLIC HEARINGS IN COMMITTEES ARE CONSISTENT WITH OPENNESS, PARTICIPATION, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concern over the bypassing of an important legislative process, public hearings in committees. I would suggest that this need not unduly delay the Republican's 100-day agenda, if each bill is appropriately scheduled.

I realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in

the last Congress. However, that does not provide an adequate legislative record.

We have many new Members to Congress and some who are new to committees. Without hearings, Members are being asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of input from constituents, interest groups, the administration, or their colleagues.

This seems inconsistent with the recent reform of House rules which are intended to increase openness, participation, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD 2 letters which address the two committees which have planned or have markups without hearings this week or next week.

The letters referred to are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Committee begins its legislative work for the 104th Congress, we wanted to express our concern about reports that the Committee is considering marking up bills without the benefit of prior public hearings on legislative proposals.

Hearings are an indispensable part of the legislative process. They provide Committee Members the opportunity to learn about the legislation, to ask questions, and to understand the impact of the legislation on interested parties. We realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in the last Congress. But hearings in prior Congresses cannot provide an adequate legislative record for several reasons. First of all, fully half of the Committee Members are new to the Committee. Without hearings, they would be asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of hearing from constituents, interest groups, the Administration, or their colleagues. Such a procedure would hardly be fair to the new Members on either side of the aisle.

In addition, even if the bills have not substantially changed, the context of those bills within the broader agenda has changed considerably. For example, in the light of expected cuts in DOE's energy R&D programs, it will be difficult for Members to assess the importance of increasing funding for hydrogen research without a better understanding of how the hydrogen program fits into overall energy research and development budget priorities.

Finally, moving legislation without public hearings would seem to be inconsistent with recent Republican reforms intended to increase openness and accountability. We do not believe that either the Members or the public will be well-served by legislating in the absence of a record.

We understand your desire to begin the Committee's work quickly. Holding hearings need not be inconsistent with moving legislation expeditiously. Indeed, markups are likely to be far smoother when Members have had an adequate opportunity to understand the measure before them.

We know that you share our hope that we can move Committee legislation in a bipartisan fashion. To foster this cooperation, it is essential that both Majority and Minority Members have the opportunity to participate in a thorough, open legislative process that includes formal hearings on legislation that will be reported from the Committee. We ap-

preciate your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 1995.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CLINGER: We understand that you have scheduled a full committee mark-up of H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 for 10 a.m., January 10. We respectfully request that you honor the request of members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee for a hearing on this important piece of legislation.

Under the leadership of Speaker Gingrich, your party has instituted a number of changes that are meant to ensure that Members of Congress and the citizens that they represent are fully informed about the legislation that is acted upon in the House of Representatives. We agree, and therefore, believe that a full committee mark-up of this legislation is premature. The hearing process allows interested constituent groups and Members of Congress an opportunity to express their views and familiarize themselves with the details of the legislative proposal under consideration. This is a fundamental and important step in the democratic process that should not be by-passed, especially in the case of legislation that addresses an issue as important as the relationship between federal, state, and local government.

We realize that hearings on unfunded mandates legislation have been held by the committee in previous Congresses. However, we understand that H.R. 5 contains new provisions. Returning members should have an opportunity to consider the new proposal prior to proceeding to the committee amending process. Also, there are many new members in the House who should be given an opportunity to examine the details of this proposal, to ask questions, and to hear the views of their colleagues and constituents through a formal hearing process.

Our hope is that we can work in a bipartisan fashion in the 104th Congress to develop sound legislation that will provide the greatest benefit to the American people. In order for this to occur, both majority and minority Members of Congress must be able to participate in a thorough, open legislative process which includes formal hearings on important legislation such as H.R. 5. We trust that you share our appreciation for the importance of maintaining an open, thorough democratic process within the House of Representatives and committees, and we thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.
JOHN D. DINGELL.
JOHN J. LaFALCE.
WILLIAM L. CLAY.
DAVID OBEY.
GEORGE MILLER.
JOE MOAKLEY.
HENRY B. GONZALEZ.
MARTIN O. SABO.
NORMAN Y. MINETA.
RONALD V. DELLUMS.
NORM DICKS.
VIC FAZIO.
DAVID BONIOR.

TIME FOR COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the people of Iowa's